1: Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

583 727 who was of course a Sangara man. One of the attackers, hearing the familiar name of his fellow tribesman, bore her back to her original village and married her. This old woman, captured, recaptured, and thrice married, was found living in contented old age with her third husband. But she said she had been well enough satisfied with each in turn and refused to express any retrospective preference.

Instances could be multiplied without making the matter clearer. A captive wife is called *jigari*, which simply means 'captive'. When, as in the usual instance, she is of another tribe, she is called *baira*, a 'stranger', though this word does not necessarily connote captivity as well.

Sometimes the captive wife was allowed to bring an infant with her, and it appears that both mother and child were well treated and settled down in their new surroundings. Buninia (who was mentioned as the husband of eleven wives) captured a woman and her young daughter. He kept the latter until she grew up and then found her attractive enough to marry also.

[578] Marriage by capture evidently did not always result in good feeling between the wife's people and the husband's. An elderly man who married his paternal uncle's widow (a captive) has never to this day visited her village, and avers that he is still afraid to do so. In another case an elderly woman never saw her people after being captured until the spread of Government control recently made it possible. Though, on the other hand, I have an instance in which the husband of a captive woman agreed to her warning her people of an impending attack; and in the [728] making of peace between tribes such women were the recognized emissaries. This points to the possibility of compensation for the capture which would follow on or be a condition to reconciliation between the tribes; though I am unable to give an instance of such tribal compensation.

583 628 In nearly all the cases of which I know, the captive woman has come from another tribe, rather than from another clan within the tribe. That is to say she has been taken as a true prisoner of war. But I have a few instances in which a woman has been captured or abducted from one clan by

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

another within the tribe; and in such cases it appears that the clan, in the absence of due compensation, would attempt a reprisal. A Bologosusu man killed the dog of a Sapute man. The latter enlisted the support of his friends, and together they raided the Bologosusu gardens, carried off a girl whom they found at work, and married her to one of their number. Now the Bologosusu people—with what exact intention is not clear—got together their supporters and attacked the Sapute faction, but were defeated with the loss of four killed against their opponent's two. Unfortunately I have no information as to how the matter ended, but it is hard to believe that the Bologosusu party, which is a strong one, should have allowed the matter to rest without some compensation from their near neighbours of Sapute. In another case the people of Koninida surrounded a girl of Suporasusu who was working in a garden with her brother. They decoyed the latter away and seized the girl. According to the Koninida informants the Suporasusu people were too weak to attempt a reprisal.

To sum up on the question of marriage by capture it is fair to suppose, in consideration of many examples, that capture has been since the beginning a common method of obtaining a wife among the Orokaiva. It is of course regarded as highly unsatisfactory by the wife's people unless they receive some compensation. In the event of ordinary capture in a cannibal raid on another tribe, the only likely form of compensation would be the capture of another woman in a retaliatory raid; though it is also conceivable that compensation of some sort, e.g. payment, should be made at the truces or peace-makings (*peka*) which occasionally took place between enemy tribes; of this, however, I can cite no examples.

In the event of a capture or abduction within the tribe it is, I believe, necessary to assume that some kind of adjustment, i.e. compensation by exchange or payment, would be made before the clans and villages concerned could settle down to live in their normal amity. Failing some such compensation the transaction remains economically unsatisfactory to one of the parties, and would inevitably lead to reprisal.

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

Reasons for Raiding

[721] The reasons for the inter-clan fighting are easy to understand: they are in the main nothing more than quarrels between hot-blooded neighbours. The reasons for the deliberate raid or *isoro*, which involves cannibalism, are not so obvious. Very commonly the raid was meant to avenge [602] some previous victim, for vengeance was absolutely imperative to the relatives of a slain man; and the expression for revenge itself is an interesting one, viz. *diroga-mine*, or an 'exchange of *diroga*', the latter meaning the spirit of a man slain in fight in contradistinction to the spirit of one who has died in any other way. Instances of compounding are apparently rare, and it may be (though I cannot speak with certainty) that the practice of compounding for death obtains between clans only, and not between tribes. The [628] compensation or blood-price, consisting of pigs and ornaments, is called *dorobu*, which word stands also for marriage payment. Between tribes, however, who normally stand in the mutual relation of *kitobu* it would seem that such amicable settlement is rare if not impossible. To show how im- [165] perative is the need for revenge I may mention the former rule that the widow of a man slain by an enemy tribe must continue her seclusion until the capture and killing of a man from that tribe made it possible for her to emerge from it.

I cannot find any binding ceremonial necessity for a raid other than the one just mentioned (and that is really a reason for returning a raid, not for making one in the first place). It appears that the corpses of victims were used in [585] payment for marriage, either *a-dorobu* or *bi-dorobu*, or for gifts between relatives. But this was probably a matter of convenience: I have no evidence that a corpse was *necessarily* part of the marriage payment. Then again there is the matter of homicidal insignia. Although these are sometimes [881] called *otobu* in common with the *otobu* given at initiation (*vide* pp. 201 ff.), it is not to be supposed that the latter were necessarily homicidal, i.e. that the killing of an enemy was demanded before a youth or girl could pass through the ceremony of receiving an *otobu*. In short, I do not know of

1: Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

765 not more than thirty yards away. The reason given for the long seclusion of widowhood was the curious one of 'shame' (*meh*). The woman, it would appear from this explanation, cannot bear to face the people of the village; though I cannot believe that it is merely her grief which she is afraid of showing, for natives are not in the habit of hiding this emotion.

'Gorukari': Ending the Seclusion

The widow's seclusion comes to an end with a feast and a ceremony called *gorukari*. This, it will be remembered, marks the second stage in the cycle of mortuary ceremonies (*vide* p. 210).

765 When, in former times, the widow's husband had been slain by an enemy tribe, her seclusion must continue till
● 628 a victim had been secured from that tribe; and it was the
[266] corpse of this victim which constituted the *pièce de résistance* of the feast. She was compelled to remain in seclusion till
765 revenge was satisfied. In the fable where a crocodile devours a man, his wife goes into seclusion immediately; but when on the following day her son captures the crocodile and drags it to the house, she comes down, stands on the creature's body, and cries, 'Why did you take my man?'; and then the people dance the *kuru* dance, and her seclusion is over.

In peaceful modern times the victims would be unprocurable, and by the same token the necessity for them does not arise. The seclusion, therefore, is brought to an end when there is a suitable accumulation of food, and its duration is correspondingly variable. The feast on this occasion is called *pusu-ijuka*, lit. 'the counting of the mud', i.e. the reckoning by which the *pusu-embo* (p. 211) are paid for their efforts at the funeral. The people of the deceased husband provide the bulk of the provisions for this feast, but they are assisted by the people of the widow. All the mourners who paid the deceased the final compliment of bedaubing themselves with mud, of wailing, or of digging his grave, are invited to receive their 'payment'; but relatives on both husband's and wife's side will contribute. Apart, however,

1:Williams E,G-5 (1923-1925) 1930
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

183 554 time during his career to take a human life, as if this were a social imperative, it is not too much to say that every individual aspired to be a man-slayer, and that his success brought him a great deal of honour.

183 628 There can be no doubt, however, that revenge was regarded as an obligation, though the obligation might be fulfilled by any one of the victim's group, just as the vengeance itself might fall upon any one of the slayer's group, and not of necessity on the guilty man himself. Vengeance with its expressive name *diroga-mine*[1]—'an exchange of the spirits of the slain'—may have had a supernatural sanction behind it, viz. the possible anger of the unavenged *diroga*, though I have never heard such an explanation expressed; but at any rate the unpaid debt of blood probably entailed a painful sense of inferiority which could only be removed by the satisfaction of killing one of the aggressors.

183 727 Needless to say there were no conventions of war, no gratuitous mercy, and no sportingness. Men—young or old—were killed; old women were killed; young women might be raped and killed or borne off to become captive wives; children were killed or made prisoners. Though, on the other hand, there was no gratuitous cruelty, the victims were not tortured; and captive women and children were treated with kindness.

183 554 Treachery, of which one or two examples have been given (pp. 166–7), was not regarded as contemptible, and according to Beaver, as we have seen, one kind of homicidal emblem was specially assigned to the slayer of a peace emissary. Towards all outsiders the correct attitude was one of

183 609 suspicion if not always of hostility; a complete stranger wandering alone would be regarded both as potential enemy and good meat; and when visitors came in friendship, as at a feast, there was never any lack of warlike readiness on either side. The very cries of welcome which are so characteristic of the Orokaiva are possibly a sign of the dormant hostility between guest and host, being recognizable in one case at least as meant for reassurance of the former regarding the intentions of the latter.

[1] See p. 170.